DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 891 SP 006 577

AUTHOR Parker, Herbert S.
TITLE The Effect of Instruction Upon Student Beliefs and Behavior. A Follow-Up Study of Some Graduate Degree Candidates Between 1969 and 1972.
PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Course Evaluation; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; *Effective Teaching; *Student Opinion; Student Reaction; *Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This pilot study was initiated with the assumption that present teacher education fails to prepare enrollees for carrying out classroom instructional responsibilities. Its purpose was to determine the effect of specific training of teachers upon a) their instructional philosophy and behavior and b) the reasons, as perceived by the graduate student, for any conflict between the two. One hundred and forty students were contacted to answer an opinionnaire; and 40 percent responded. They were asked questions on their present instructional philosophy and opinions of educational procedures. Results were compared with all propositions set forth in the instructional goals of their course; a median of 87 percent of the respondents supported all these propositions. Responses to questions describing student behavior were compared with the statements of their beliefs, and it was found conflict did exist in all designated areas. Reasons were not given by the respondents in all cases, though, of the reasons given, lack of administrative support occurred frequently. (Tables indicating results are included in the text, and the letter to former students and the opinionnaire are appended.) (JA)

ED 077891

# THE EFFECT OF INSTRUCTION UPON STUDENT BELIEFS AND BEHAVIOR

## A Follow-up Study of Some Graduate Degree Candidates Between 1969 and 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prof. Herbert S. Parker
Dept. of Education Arts and Systems
Newark State College
Union, New Jersey

May 1973

SP 006 577

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

INTRODUCTION

Teaching is assumed to have an effect upon the behavior of students AFTER they leave the influence of the teacher. After all, teachers do spend a great deal of time, and a great deal of expense is incurred with the expectation that what is taught is perceived to be relevant enough by the learner to be assimilated and acted upon some place other than in the simulated environment of the classroom. However, the effect of teacher education as a modifier of teacher candidate behavior has been questioned, " ..Most teacher training programs do little to develop in the teacher-trainee any action system through which the result of teacher training may be manifested in the classroom."[1] With the relatively recent emphasis upon the specification of performance criteria in the certification of teachers[2] and in the validating of instructional processes, training institutions need to investigate their ability to specify learning outcomes to design instructional procedures that can be evaluated vis a vis those specifications.

If teacher-trainers assume that they can specify learning outcomes of a given instructional sequence within the instructional environment they must also assume that they can measure whether those outcomes have been achieved. (Colleges do, after all, purport to measure and certify to achievement.) Further then, it seems an incumbent responsibility upon those who attempt to modify the behavior of their students in some way, to determine whether that behavior has transcended the instructional environment and if not, why not and if so, why?

---

[1] Wallen, N.E., and Travers, R.M., "Analysis and Investigation of Teaching Methods", Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N.L. Gage (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963, p. 460)

[2] Elam, S., "Performance-Based Teacher Education- What Is the State Of The Art?" (Mimeographed, AACTE. Washington, 1971)

There are two fairly commonly heard student comments in teacher training institutions. The first is that what is taught in the (training) classroom "sounds good" but when it comes to making it work in the "field" some of the many intervening variables discussed in training seem to make teacher training of little practical value. The other often repeated complaint from teachers newly assigned to their classes and schools relates to administrative control of their instructional behavior. A new teacher's good intentions are many times subverted by the exigencies of administrative survival.

Since teacher training purports to prepare its enrollees for carrying out classroom instructional responsibilities it seems that the evaluation of teacher training as presently constituted is remiss. Actually, a very small portion of the instruction which goes in to make up teacher training is evaluated in terms of the aforementioned student behavior i.e., carrying out the classroom instructional responsibilities. Either teacher training must redesign its evaluation model or redefine its instructional goals and objectives.

PURPOSE FOR STUDY

In September of 1969 this investigator began teaching at Newark State College after spending years in an executive capacity in industry. A portion of his teaching responsibility at NSC was for courses in curriculum development. His belief was that such courses should reflect consideration of the proposition that "...public schools have never clearly stated a system of objectives in a manner more explicit than the most general, nor have they arrived at any strong concensus about goals."[1] Though each course he taught differed in individual learning outcomes, each proposed that teaching and curriculum development be

1 Le Baron, W., "System Theory: Some Applications for Curriculum & Instruction." (Mimeographed Unpublished Work by System Development Corp.,) Santa Monica: System Development Corp., 1969 p. 11.

viewed as systems that:

- defined their objectives in terms of student performances, the conditions under which that performance was to be executed where possible and the criteria by which that performance was to be evaluated.

- focused upon individualization of instruction by means of maximum utilization of self-instruction in defining and achieving learning objectives, and

- recognized the variety of entry behaviors presented by students in any learning situation and which consequently requires the assessment of entering behavior prior to the designing of instructional models. This, to enable all students assigned or selecting to enroll in that instructional offering, to have access to the instruction at a level that most promises personal success.

By summer of 1972 after three years of instructing, one hundred and forty (140) students had been exposed to the aforementioned philosophy of curriculum development and design, implementation and evaluation schemata. It was time to initiate a survey of those students to determine:

1. What their beliefs, desires and philosophy are presently vis a vis the philosophy and methodology of the systems approach (as taught).

2. What form their instructional behavior took vis a vis the propositions for the design, implementation and evaluation of a systems approach to instruction (as taught) and,

3. Whether there were differences between (1) and (2) and if so, why.

It was presumed that with the forgoing feed-back an assessment could be made concerning the effectiveness of the instruction and the validity in assuming subsequent implementation of learned behaviors (by means of their introducing systems principles into their schools and classrooms). However, the implementation of a systems approach to instruction requires a reorientation of traditionally held concepts of schooling. Obviously, this is very difficult to do a-priorially and when you are "toying" with a child's development, parents tend to become protective and non-experimental in their orientation.

DESIGN OF STUDY

A pilot study was conceived to investigate the feasibility of following up graduated students in so far as determining the effect of specific training upon (1) instructional philosophy and instructional behavior and, (2) the reasons, as perceived by the graduated student, for any conflict between the two.

One hundred and forty (140) students were contacted by mail and requested to participate[1], return addressed and stamped envelopes were provided. Fifty-four (54) responded, nine (9) were returned due to incorrect addresses and seventy-seven (77) did not reply, hence approximately 40% of the target population participated in the survey.

Responses would be tabulated to summarize.

1. The current instructional philosophy (beliefs) of the sample vis a vis the instructional goals of the courses in "curriculum",

2. The "conflict" between instructional philosophy and instructional behavior vis a vis the instructional goals of the courses in Curriculum, and

3. The reason for the conflict between instructional philosophy and instructional behavior, if any.

[1] A copy of the letter and questionnaire appear in the Appendix to this report.

TABLE - 1
(N-54)

OPINION REGARDING CONTENT SELECTION FOLLOWING THE DEFINITION OF RELEVANT INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSE. (Item II-7)

| | NA* | SD/D* | U* | A AS* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| f | 0 | 4 | 3 | 47 |
| % | 0 | 7.4 | 12.0 | 73.5 |

A large majority of respondents (approximately 80%) believed that selection of course content, i.e., what should be taught, should not be finalized until what is purposeful and relevant to the students can be ascertained. 7.4% disagreed with this proposition and 12.0% were uncertain.

---

* Key: NA - No Answer; SD/D - Strongly Disagree Disagree; U - Uncertain; A SA - Agree/ Strongly Agree.

TABLE - 2
(II-5A)

OPINIONS REGARDING VALIDATING INSTRUCTION BY MEANS OF LEARNER PERCEIVED RELEVANCE OF THE PURPOSE OF THAT INSTRUCTION. (Item II-8)

| | NA | SD | D | U | A | SA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| f | 0 | | 4 | 3 | 47 | |
| % | 0 | | 7.3 | 5.5 | 87 | |

The results of this question further amplifies the data in Table - 1. It relates purposeful instruction with the learner's perceptions of its relevance. In other words the mere intent of the instruction is not enough to make instruction valid, the instructional intent must be perceived and considered by the learner as relevant to him. When this distinction was made (in the question) 87% of the respondents believed that instructional planning should await the determination of learner relevance whereas 7.3% opposed this proposition. 5.5% reported being uncertain. The uncertain group decreased from approximately 13% to 5.5% in comparing item numbers II-7 and II-8.

TABLE - 3
(N-54)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR: INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES SHOULD (Table A) AND IS/IS NOT (Table B) STATED IN TERMS OF ANTICIPATED STUDENT PERFORMANCES.
(Items II-1 and III-2)

| | (A) | | | | (B) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NA | SD/D | U | A/SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
| f | 1 | 1 | 1 | 51 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 25 |
| % | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 94.3 | 9.2 | 9.2 | 35.1 | 46.2 |

Table (A) reports that 94.3% of the respondents support the proposition that instructional objectives should be stated in terms describing anticipated student performance. Table (B) reports that 35.1% of those responding, to some degree, define their instructional objectives in terms of their students performances while 46.2% indicate that this is their instructional "modus operandi". Approximately 10% (9.2) reported that they did not describe their instructional objectives in terms of student performance and a like number did not respond. Of note is the small percentage (1.8%) of disagreement with the philosophy of student performance as an inherent part of instructional objectives but the larger, by five fold (9.2%) group of respondents who reported instructional behavior contradicting their "beliefs". Also, one might ask why did 9.2% choose not to reply to the question describing their behavior when only 1.8% did not reply to the question concerning their beliefs.

TABLE - 4
(II-5A)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR: ENTRY LEVEL BEHAVIOR SHOULD (Table A) AND IS/IS NOT (Table B) ASSESSED AT THE VERY BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION. (Items II.-2 and III-3)

| | (A) | | | | (B) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NA | SD/D | U | A/SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
| f | 1 | 1 | 0 | 52 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 19 |
| % | 1.8 | 1.8 | 0 | 92.2 | 7.4 | 22.2 | 35.1 | 35.1 |

Table (A) reports that 96.2% of the respondents support the proposition that entry level behavior should be determined prior to the start of instruction. Table (B) reports that approximately 70%, to a greater or lesser degree, consider this concept and implement it in their instructional behavior. 22.2% reported that entry level behavior was not assessed prior to their initiating instruction and 7.4% didn't reply to question III-3. Of note is the difference between the 1.8% (one person) who disagreed with the concept of entry level assessment and the 22.2% (12 persons) who conduct their classes in a way that is in contradiction to their beliefs.

TABLE -5
(N-54)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR: LEARNERS SHOULD BE (Table A) AND ARE/ARE NOT ABLE TO ACCESS THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM AT THEIR INDIVIDUAL PROFICIENCY LEVEL. (Items II-2 and III-4)

| | (A) | | | | (B) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NA | SD/D | U | A/SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
| f | 1 | 1 | 0 | 52 | 4 | 16 | 18 | 16 |
| % | 1.3 | 1.8 | 0 | 96.2 | 7.4 | 29.5 | 33.3 | 29.5 |

The assessment of entry level proficiency implies that some attempt will be made to align the learner's proficiency with the intent of the instruction. Table 5-A indicates that 96.2% of the respondents believe that such an assessment should bemade prior to the outset of instruction. However, Table 5-B reports that in their actual instructional behavior, some respondents (29.5%) do not enable their student's to enter an instructional experience at his "level". A like amount report that they do enable their students to access instruction at his proficiency level. 33.3% reported that they implement this concept to "some" degree. Why are approximately 30% behaving in a way contrary to their beliefs?

TABLE - 6
(N-54)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR: THE TEACHER, SCHOOL OR COMMUNITY SHOULD (Table A) AND DOES/DOES NOT (Table B) DEFINE INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS. (Items II-3 and III-5)

| | (A) | | | | | (B) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NA | SD/D | U | A | SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
| f | 1 | 5 | 7 | 41 | 4 | 3 | 20 | 27 | |
| % | 1.8 | 9.2 | 12.9 | 75.8 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 37.0 | 49.9 | |

Approximately 76% of the respondents believe that teacher, the school or the community should define instructional goals i.e. a broad statement of instructional intent. Approximately 23% are uncertain or disagree with this proposition. In actuality 37% of the respondents indicate that goals are so defined to some degree and approximately 50% reported that that is in fact the case. For the 5.5% who that someone else defines the goals of instruction there is no indication as to who that someone else is.

TABLE - 7
(N-54)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR:
THE STUDENT SHOULD (Table A) AND IS (IS NOT A
PARTICIPANT IN DEFINING HIS LEARNING OBJECTIVES.
(Items II-4 and III-6)

| | NA | SD/D | U | A/SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| f | 0 | 5 | 4 | 45 | 4 | 17 | 16 | 17 |
| % | 0 | 9.2 | 7.4 | 83.2 | 7.4 | 31.3 | 29.5 | 31.3 |

A strong majority support the proposition that students should participate in the difition of their own learning objectives; however, 7.4% were uncertain and 9.2% were opposed to this concept. In-so-far as their instructional practices, the respondents were almost evenly split between implementing this concept and not implementing it. The approximately 30% who were implementing the concept to <u>some</u> degree suggest that a majority of the respondents do involve their students in the definition of his/her personal learning objectives. There still remains approximately 23% of the respondents that conduct their classes in a manner other than the way the believe to be "right" (83.2% less 60.8%)

TABLE - 8
(N-54)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR:
THE STUDENT SHOULD BE (Table A) AND IS IS NOT (Table B)
ADVISED AT THE BEGINNING OF INSTRUCTION, THE
CRITERIA BY WHICH HIS PERFORMANCE WILL BE EVALUATED.
(Items II-5 and III-7)

| | NA | SD/D | U | A SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| f | 1 | 1 | 1 | 51 | 4 | 9 | 17 | 24 |
| % | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 94.3 | 7.4 | 16.6 | 31.3 | 44.4 |

The overwhelming reaction (94.3%) to the validity of this concept is evidenced by the number who support it. Approximately 75% report that they implement this concept or do so to some extent. Once again one notes the decrepancy between the group that believes one thing and does another.

TABLE - 9
(N-54)

CONTRAST OF BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR:
STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT SHOULD BE (Table A) AND IS/IS NOT (Table B)
REPORTED IN TERMS OF PERFORMANCES DEMONSTRATED.
(Item II-6 and III-8)

| | (A) | | | | | (B) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | NA | SD | D | U | A | SA | NA | No | Some | Yes |
| f | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 47 | | 4 | 12 | 19 | 19 |
| % | 0 | 0 | | 12.9 | 86.9 | 7.4 | 22.2 | 35.1 | 35.1 | |

Whereas Table A indicates that there were no dissenters to the proposition of reporting student achievement in performance terms Table B indicates that 22.2% did not report student achievement in that way and an additional 35.1% reported student achievement in performance terms "to some degree". Only 35.1% reported that they behaved in a manner consisent with their beliefs. This does not mean to imply that other "believers" were dishonest, their circumstances may not have permitted them the option. This will be further discussed in Chapter V.

TABLE - 10
(N-54)

INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT REPORTED AS GRADES OR AVERAGES. (Item III-9)

| | NA | No | Some | Yes |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| f | 4 | 11 | 6 | 33 |
| % | 7.4 | 20.3 | 11.1 | 61.1 |

This table serves to supplement the data in Table 9. In Table 9-A 86.9% of the respondents reported that they believed that student achievement should be reported in performances terms. Table 10 indicates that 20.3% of the respondents do not report student achievement in terms of grades or averages. It would be expected that approximately 13% would fall in the "NO" column on Table 10 for a perfect match between behavior and belief. Further, by combining the "some" and "yes" responses on Tables 9-B and 10 we find no agreement i.e., 72% report student achievement as grades or averages and 70% (see Table 9-B) report that they report student achievement, all or to some degree, in terms of performances demonstrated. There is obviously some confusion on the part of the respondents with regard to these questions.

TABLE - 11

DISTRIBUTION OF REASONS FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR. (Item III-10)

| | NA | b | c | d | e |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| f | 21 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 11 |
| % | 37.8 | | 42.4 | | | 19.8 |

This question permitted multiple responses, hence, whereas the response tabulated total 45, only 33 individuals actually replied to this questions Thus, one of the most significant facts represented by Table 11 may well be that approximately 38% of those responding to survey chose not to reply even though they did have the option of a free response (e). (The description of the group may be found in Table 12).

Three respondents indicated that a reason for not being able to act consistently with their beliefs may be attributed, in part (all reasons) to their lack of knowledge or skill. This could be deemed as an instructional deficiency in teacher education.

Eleven respondents reported reasons other than b-c- or d as explanations for their inconsistent behavior. (Table 13 summarizes the reasons put forth under alternative "e".)

Alternatives "b", "c" and "d" i.e., budget, planning time and a lack of administrative support are all interpreted by this researcher as a lack of administrative support (which could mean by the building administrators, superintendent or Board of Education). The respondents selecting these alternatives make up a significant percentage of the total responses to this question (22 out of 33, 67%) which would suggest that for this limited sample a lack of administrative support is a greater inhibitor to the implementation of performance based instructional systems than is the training of teachers HOW to design and implement such systems.

TABLE - 12

DISTRIBUTION OF NA'S TO QUESTION III-10
ACCORDING TO POSITION AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

| Exp. / Pos. | Less Than 4 yrs. | Between 4 - 10 yrs. | More Than 10 yrs. | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher F-T | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| Teacher P-T | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Admin. F-T | 0 | 1 | 7 | 8 |
| Admin. P-T | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Other | 4 | 2 | 0 | 6 |
| Totals | 6 | 6 | 9 | 21 |

Ten (10) of the twenty one (21) non-responders to this question were primarily in non-teaching positions in education and seven (7) were either not employed or employed in non-education professions. Hence, only five teachers found the NA alternative appropriate, a relatively small group. However, seventeen (17) found the alternatives not adequate reflections of their views and this suggests poor design of question III-10. Perhaps alternatives seeking to account for the differences between <u>administrative</u> behavior and <u>administrative</u> belief would have elicited greater response from that portion of the non-responder group. Table 13 describes "Other" reasons, it may shed some light on this problem.

TABLE - 13

SUMMARY OF "OTHER" RESPONSES TO QUESTION SEEKING REASONS FOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN BELIEF AND INSTRUCTIONAL BEHAVIOR (Item III-10e) (N-11)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. "Converted from subject centered approach to performance-based. Now seeking to implement..... | 3 |
| 2. As an administrator, "I find modifying teacher behavior very difficult ..... | 2 |
| 3. Should have selected from alternatives offered, i.e., a-b-c-d ..... | 8 |
| (a) ..... | 2 |
| (b) ..... | 1 |
| (c) ..... | 1 |
| (d) ..... | 4 |
| 4. Community pressures inhibits implementation of this instructional philosophy ..... | 1 |
| 5. Not employed in teaching ..... | 2 |

* Eleven responders, each whom could indicate preference for one or more of the alternatives.

Table 13 was provided to further explain the data in Table 11. The category,. . lack of administrative support . . "was indicated six (6) times ( by four respondents) thus reducing the percentage of those selecting alternative (e) to 12.6% and increasing the responses to categories a,b,c and d to approximately 79% (78.7). Two additional reasons were reported: three respondents (all F-T teachers) report being in the process of implementing a performance based philosophy and hence didn't feel that there was any real difference between their beliefs and their instructional behavior and, two respondents (F-T administrators) indicated a need for more effective measures to accelerate the modification of teacher behavior. A category titled, lack of teacher support, might have enable administrators to reflect their difficulties more accurately .

SUMMARY

A current issue in education is the specification of learner outcomes for given instructional programs. This issue suggests that it is reasonable to assume that there is a significant cause and effect relationship between teacher intentions and his students' post-instructional behavior. Does a student's performance in the "simulated" environment of the classroom truly reflect his behavior after he leaves the classroom? Is the teacher a significant influence upon his student's post-instructional behavior? What are some of the other factors affecting post-instructional behavior of students and to what extent do these factors affect the achievement of instructional goals (regardless of how well classroom assessment indicates their achievement).

This pilot study sought to determine the extent to which instructional intentions affected post-instructional behavior of a selected group of graduate students in teacher education and to explore the reasons for differences ( if any) as perceived by the students surveyed.[1]

Eight questions in Part II of the survey were posed to determine post-instructional affect upon student beliefs. Between 76% and 96% (Median 87%) of the respondents supported all the propositions set forth in the instructional goals of their courses i.e.,

"Teaching and curriculum development be viewed as systems that:

* defined their objectives in terms of student performances, the conditions under which that performance was to be executed and the criteria by which that performance was to be evaluated;

* focused on individualization through the utilization of student self-instruction in achieving and defining his objectives, and

[1] This investigator did not formally identify the beliefs of students before instruction began however, the thrust of the instruction was presented in the form of goal statements and it was informally determined, through inquiry, that the philosophy and conceptualization of the course goals was at best minimally understood by the students enrolled and surveyed.

* recognize the variety of entry level behaviors presented by students in any learning situation and consequently require the assessment of that entry level behavior in designing instructional models that enable all students assigned or selecting enrollment, to access the instructional model at a level promising maximum personal success."

Responses to questions describing student behavior were compared with the statements of their beliefs to determine conflict and it was found that conflict did exist in all investigated areas. This conflict ranged from a low of 9% to a high of 38% of the respondent population, the median level was 22%.[1] When reasons for conflict was studied it was found that a lack of administrative support[2] was reported by approximately 80% of the responding population. Thirty-eight (38) percent of the participating sample did not choose to give any reason for their conflict even though an opportunity was provided to state some "other" reason than those proffered.

From this investigation of a small sample of (N-140) students enrolled in graduate teacher education it is concluded that further follow-up studies related to the questions posed are appropriate as whereas the limited sample does not suggest generalizable conclusions the indications of these data are that:

1. the belief of students enrolled in (this investigator's) classes in curriculum development, determined from 6 months to 2½ years subsequent to the end of their training, were largely in agreement (87% of the time) with those proposed in the course and by instructional systems theory,

2. student behavior implementing their beliefs was in conflict 22% of the time, and

3. the reason for conflict between the desire to act and the perceived opportunity to act was attributed to a lack of "administrative support."

If one were to accept these data, this conflict may be minimized if greater involvement was effected between those that control the instructional environment

---

1 See Tables 1-9

2 The following alternatives were provided as examples of a lack of administrative support: (b) I don't have adequate budget for the materials, (c) I don't have adequate planning time, (d) The administration doesn't support the philosophy of individualized instructional systems as described in the aforementioned courses.

(administrators, supervisors and to a lesser degree policy makers), those that train persons for action in those environments (in this instance, teacher trainers) and the trainees themselves. If the administration were to become more aware of their employees learning objectives it might facilitate the translations of those learnings into on-site action. Finally, it is suggested that a sharing in the goal defining process by all parties concerned might suggest more relevant instructional experiences in teacher training institutions as well as workable strategies for teachers in effecting changes in their classrooms and schools.

# APPENDIX

**NEWARK STATE COLLEGE**
**UNION, NEW JERSEY 07083**

July 27, 1972

AN OPEN LETTER TO FORMER STUDENTS
who were enrolled in:

Curriculum Improvement in the Public Schools,
Principles and Programs of Secondary Education,
Workshop in Instructional Systems Design

NEWARK STATE COLLEGE and the Department of Educational Arts and Systems is currently engaged in reviewing and assessing its graduate and undergraduate teacher education programs. As a part of this appraisal would you assist me by completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire? If you desire a copy of the findings of this survey please contact the departmental secretary at W105 after November 1st and a copy will be provided.

You are one of a small group (180) of students who had enrolled and completed one of the foregoing courses as taught by me. Though each differed in individual terminal objectives, each proposed that teaching and curriculum development be viewed as systems that:

* defined their objectives in terms of student performances, the conditions under which that performance was to be executed and the criteria by which that performance was to be evaluated

* focused on individualization through utilization of student self-instruction in achieving and defining his objectives;

* recognize the variety of entry level behaviors presented by students in any learning situation and consequently requires the assessment of that entry behavior in designing instructional models that enable all students assigned or selecting enrollment, to access the instructional model at a level promising success.

In addition, behavioral objectives, cognitive and affective domains of learning and learning tasks analysis were discussed in the light of curriculum development and teaching/learning models.

In all courses implementation of these concepts was encouraged and the enrollees' terminal behavior included the development of mini-systems or instructional modules incorporating these concepts. Many of you reported trying these ideas out in your schools and classrooms before the course was over.

Now, as part of my own self-assessment and in hopes of affecting changes within the department's teacher education programs I would like to know how you feel and think about these matters and of the usefullness of the instruction you received in the areas of instructional systems and performance based instruction. Your opinion and suggestions will be seriously considered in my recommendations to the department's curriculum committee.

Thank you.

Herbert S. Parker, Ed. D.
Professor of Education

HSP/mf

## Graduate Student Opinionnaire

I. Identifying information

1. Are you a
   - Full time teacher.....( )a
   - Part time teacher.....( )b
   - Full time Administrator*.....( )c
   - Part time Administrator.....( )d
   - Other (Please specify).....( )e

2. Years experience in education
   - less than four years.....( )a
   - four or more, but less than 10 years.....( )b
   - 10 or more years.....( )c

3. Instructional level of experience (if more than one, so indicate)
   - the above noted experience is in a K-6 program.....( )a
   - " " " " 7-9 program.....( )b
   - " " " " 10-12 program.....( )c

4. During your years of experience, were you assigned to teach
   - specific subjects.....( )a
   - all subjects, i.e., a core type program.....( )b
   - a combination of subjects that suggested a multi-disciplinary (math and science, eng. and s.s. approach.....( )c

II. Part II is divided into two sections (A & B).

Section A requests your views regarding your <u>beliefs</u>, <u>desires</u> and <u>philosophy</u>.

Section B requests your views regarding your <u>instructional and/or administrative behavior</u>: i.e., how you actually perform your professional duties.

It is possible that your replies to section A and B will be the same, if so, reply accordingly to each statement in each section.

*Administrator refers to any professional position affecting instruction, it includes such positions as curriculum coordinator, department chairman, assistant principal, etc.: i.e., anyone whose job requires him/her to influence other professionals.

III. Section B: Indicate your replies on the scales to the right of each statement. these statements refer to YOUR PRESENT TEACHING AND/OR ADMINISTRATIVE BEHAVIOR i.e., how you actually perform your professional duties.

1. The answers to the following questions refer to my
   school.....( )
   class(es).....( )

2. Instruction is conceived as a system with its objectives stated in terms of anticipated student performance(s).
   No _____ some _____ Yes

3. The entry level behavior of all students is assessed at the very beginning of instruction.
   No _____ some _____ Yes

4. Instruction is provided that enables each student to enter the system at a point where the prognosis for success is most favorable.
   No _____ some _____ Yes

5. Instructional goals (as teacher, school or community defined).
   No _____ some _____ Yes

6. Instructional objectives are defined in terms of student performances and consequently involve students in their definition.
   No _____ some _____ Yes

7. Students are advised at the beginning of instruction, of the criteria by which their performance will be evaluated.
   No _____ some _____ Yes

8. Student achievement is described in terms of performances demonstrated.
   No _____ some _____ Yes

9. Student achievement is described in terms of letter grades and/or numerical averages.
   No _____ some _____ Yes

10. If you feel that what you believe and what you are doing differs significantly (as evidenced by your replies in Sections A and B), indicate the SINGLE most contributing factor:

    I don't know how to implement the theory or philosophy..... ( )a
    I don't have adequate budget for the materials..... ( )b
    I don't have adequate planning time..... ( )c
    The "administration" doesn't support the philosophy of individualized instructional systems as described in the aforementioned courses..... ( )d
    Other: please specify on reverse side..... ( )e